Tr. R.
G 786

Great and Weighty

CONSIDERATIONS

Relating to the

D. or Successor of the Crown,

Humbly offer'd to the

Kings Most Excellent Majesty,

AND

Both Houses of Parliament.

By a True Patriot.

May it please Your Majesty,

HE is undoubtedly to be reputed the best Friend to his King and Countrey whom neither the Fear of any Worldly Powers can deter or hinder to speak, nor the love of any Temporal advantages can induce to dissemble the Truth; especially in such serious and weighty matters, as mainly concern the welfare both of Church and State. For, whosoever lays aside all the alluring Considerations of Self-Interest, and chooses rather to expose himself to the displeasure of a prevailing Faction, than see the Truth oppress'd by any feign'd pretences, though never so specious or plausible, he sufficiently demonstrates by the sincerity of his intentions, how Faithful he is to God, and how Loyal to his Prince.

This plain and undoubted verity, (most Gracious Sovereign) encourageth me at present to offer unto your most Excellent Majesty this my humble Address, briefly comprising such Reasons, as perswade me so much to mislike many particulars of our present proceedings, whereby most preposterously we endeavour to establish the true Reformed Religion in this Kingdom, by overthrowing the chiefest Principle and Maxim thereof; which is fulln epitomiz'd in this excellent Precept, *Give every one his due.*

I cannot indeed but highly extol the rare constancy of our Leading Men in the true Protestant Religion, and their fervent zeal to maintain and establish the same for ever; as also their extraordinary care and diligence to suppress Popery, and all Fanatical Leven: But I find their Zeal doth so far transport many of them beyond the limits of Justice and Equity, that unless they steer their course more conformably to the Divine *Cynosura* of all Humane Actions, the Word and Will of God, I am afraid we shall have ere long as much reason to blame them for the one, as praise them for the other.

548850

Tr. R.
G 786

Great and Weighty

CONSIDERATIONS

Relating to the

D. or Successor of the Crown.

Humbly offer'd to the

Kings Most Excellent Majesty,

AND

Both Houses of Parliament.

By a True Patriot.

May it please Your Majesty,

HE is undoubtedly to be reputed the best Friend to his King and Countrey whom neither the Fear of any Worldly Powers can deter or hinder to speak, nor the love of any Temporal advantages can induce to dissemble the Truth; especially in such serious and weighty matters, as mainly concern the welfare both of Church and State. For, whosoever lays aside all the alluring Considerations of Self-Interest, and chooses rather to expose himself to the displeasure of a prevailing Faction, than see the Truth oppress'd by any feign'd pretences, though never so specious or plausible, he sufficiently demonstrates by the sincerity of his intentions, how Faithful he is to God, and how Loyal to his Prince.

This plain and undoubted verity, (most Gracious Sovereign) encourageth me at present to offer unto your most Excellent Majesty this my humble Address, briefly comprising such Reasons, as perswade me so much to mislike many particulars of our present proceedings, whereby most preposterously we endeavour to establish the true Reformed Religion in this Kingdom, by overthrowing the chiefest Principle and Maxim thereof; which is fulln epitomiz'd in this excellent Precept, *Give every one his due.*

I cannot indeed but highly extol the rare constancy of our Leading Men in the true Protestant Religion, and their fervent zeal to maintain and establish the same for ever; as also their extraordinary care and diligence to suppress Popery, and all Fanatical Leven: But I find their Zeal doth so far transport many of them beyond the limits of Justice and Equity, that unless they steer their course more conformably to the Divine *Cynosura* of all Humane Actions, the Word and Will of God, I am afraid we shall have ere long as much reason to blame them for the one, as praise them for the other.

548850

To eſtabliſh firmly the true Proteſtant Religion, is undoubtedly a great and glorious action; but to eſtabliſh it upon the Quickſands of Humane Policy, or upon grounds repugnant to the Laws both of God and Nature, is a thing, whereof neither I, nor (I hope) any faithful Chriſtian will ever approve. Hypocrites indeed, and ſome factious Spirits of the Phanatical Leven, who make a Cloak of Religion to palliate their black Deſigns, by their ſeditious Pamphlets do daily labour to perſwade the World, that nothing can be ſo Sacred, which muſt not be ſacrific'd to their pretended Religion. And upon this ground as the Rump-Parliament has Sacrific'd the beſt of Kings ſo ſome fiery Zealots now endeavour to Sacrifice the beſt of Princes, your Majeſties onely Brother. But the beſt and moſt conſcientious Proteſtants do utterly abhor and deteſt ſuch Antichriſtian attempts, as being wholly repugnant to the Ordnance of God, and to the fundamental Laws of this Kingdom. Neither did they ever approve of that Anarchical Bill lately fram'd by ſome turbulent Zealots of the Houſe of Commons againſt his Royal Highneſs, wherein they peremptorily aſſume to themſelves a Sovereign and Deſpotical Power of Depoſing Princes, and diſpoſing of Kingdoms, as their ſpirit moves them; and withal moſt impudently affirm, that this has been the ancient cuſtom of Parliaments: Whereas it's evident to all the World, that the Imperial Crown of *England* has always been Hereditary, and never depending on the Votes or Suffrages of the Subject.

Nay, it is undeniable that the ſucceſſion of the Crown was always hitherto held ſo Sacred and inviolable, that no Crime whatſoever, no attainder of Treaſon could debar the next Heir of Blood from ſucceeding in the Government, as *Coke* upon *Littleton*, *Sect.* 8. *page* 16. teſtifieth in theſe words: *If the right Heir of the Crown be attainted of Treaſon, yet the Crown ſhall deſcend to him*, & eo inſtante *(without any other reverſal) the attainder is utterly avoided, as it fell out in the Caſe of* Henry *the Seventh.*

But theſe cunning Politicians now will have a new model of Government; that ſo all the world may acknowledge our Omnipotent Parliament, (*i. e.* themſelves,) to have an Abſolute and Independent power, not only over mean Subjects, but alſo over the Royal Family; nay, over the King himſelf, and to have power to degrade or depoſe them, as they pleaſe. For they are ſure, that by whatſoever Law, Power, or pretence, the Parliament can diſ-inherit or depoſe the Heir, by the ſame they may likewiſe depoſe the Poſſeſſor of the Crown; as the Rump Parliament, *de facto*, has done.

To what purpoſe then ſhould any true Proteſtant, or any man of ſenſe, that loves either King or Country, approve of ſuch an extravagant Bill; which Gilded over, like poiſoned Pills, with the ſpecious pretence of eſtabliſhing the true Proteſtant Religion, is like to deſtroy the very root and life of our Government? Or, what (in Gods name) do we mean by this pretence of Religion? Do we intend to out-reach the Divine Providence, or do we deſpair either of the juſtneſs of our cauſe, or of the goodneſs of God? Do not we remember how the Apoſtle tells us, *that evil is not to be done, that good may come of it?* Or do not we know, that whatſoever God affects in goodneſs, he doth effect by good means, and doth not want our wickedneſs to fulfil his holy will? Is there no other way of eſtabliſhing the true Proteſtant Religion, but by robbing thoſe we ſhould honour and obey, and depriving them of that, which God and Nature has beſtowed upon them; I mean their Birthright? Far be it from the heart of a Chriſtian, eſpecially a Proteſtant, to think ſo ill of the all-ſeeing Providence of the Almighty. For, what is this, but exactly to follow the footſteps of that monſter of ingratitude, the wicked *Jeroboam*, who after God of his infinite goodneſs had raiſed him from nothing, and eſtabliſhed him Monarch of the ten Tribes of *Iſrael*, yet was he ſo miſtruſtful of Gods power in preſerving his Kingdom for the future, that he thought nothing could ſecure it but his own accurſed Policy? 1 *King.* 12. 26, 27. Was not the true Proteſtant Religion ſettled in this Nation by the ſame mighty hand of God, that eſtabliſhed *Jeroboam* in the Kingdom of *Iſrael*? Shall we then like that wicked King, ſo far deſpair of Gods Providence in preſerving the work of his own hands, as never to think it ſecure, unleſs it be eſtabliſh'd upon the quick-ſands of our own wicked inventions? Should not we rather be terrified at that dreadful woe pronounced by the Prophet *Jeremy*, *Woe unto him that buildeth his houſe by unrighteouſneſs, or his Chambers by wrong*, Jer. 22. 13. *O inſenſati Galatæ* (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *Gal.* 3. 1.) O fooliſh and timerous Countrymen, who hath bewitched you, that you ſhould be of ſo little Faith, as to believe

that

that a King of *England*, though the most zealous of Papists, can ever subvert the true Protestant Religion, or the present Government of this Kingdom, while we know him so far engaged by the fundamental Laws of the Land, that he can hardl move or stir, but with a concentrick motion to both Houses of Parliament? Especially, while we daily see, how in our very neighbourhood, (to omit *Germany*, *Poland*, and other places) the *French* Kings ever since the Reformation, have been most zealous Papists, and withall the most absolute and arbitrary Soveraigns of all Christian Monarchs; and yet all this while could not suppress the Reformed Religion there, nor hinder the over-ruling Providence of the Almighty, who has even in that Kingdom, notwithstanding all Popish opposers, preserved to himself a Remnant, not of seven (as he speaks of the Kingdom of *Israel*) but of seventy, or rather seven hundred thousand, that bow'd not the knee to *Baal*, that is, submitted not to the intolerable yoke of *Romish* Traditions? And if Gods over-ruling Providence has so far prevailed in protecting his people at the very dawning of the Reformation, and in causing Papists themselves become Protestants, notwithstanding all the Cruel Laws then in force against them, and all the opposition of a Popish; nay, of a most Absolute and Arbitrary Soveraign, who might *ad libitum*, make severer Laws against them and their Doctrine: Shall we of little faith, be so mistrustful of his goodness, now in the very Meridian of the Gospel, as to believe that a King of *England*, (a King so far obliged by the fundamental Laws of his Kingdom, and by all tyes imaginable, to be advised in all weighty matters by a free Representative of the whole Nation, that without this Representative he can neither repeal the Penal Statutes enacted against Papists, nor yet enact any, though he would, against the Protestant Religion) shall we, I say, believe that such a King, and in such Circumstances, though never so zealous a Papist, can induce or perswade his Subjects, who once received the full light and liberty of the Gospel, ever to submit to the Yoke of Popish Superstitions?

Do not we remember, how in Queen *Mary*'s time, the Protestant Religion was in a manner in its Infancy in this Kingdom, and yet how miraculously it was preserved, notwithstanding all the endeavours of that active Queen, and all the Penal Laws then in force against it: And now being in its prime, and so firmly established and fenced by Law, shall we despair of Gods power to preserve it, unless we help him out with our wickedness? Certainly we must either believe the whole Nation is inclined to Popery, or the Protestant Religion is grounded on very weak Foundations, otherwise we cannot thus think it impossible, either to secure our Faith and Liberties so well established by Law, or keep off the Tyranny of the See of *Rome* from stealing upon us, under a Popish Successor, who can neither make any new Statutes in favour of Popery, nor yet alter the present Government, without the consent of a Parliament.

It is an unwarrantable attempt, and a point without Example or President, to disinherit or depose a Prince for not complying with his People in Religion: Neither can our seditious Pamphleters most impertinent Examples any thing justifie such violent proceedings. They alledge, that King *Asa* remov'd his Mother *Maachah* from being Queen, because of her Idolatry, 2 *Chron.* 15. But they might as well justifie *Cromwel*'s Tyrannical Usurpation, by alledging the example of *Jeroboam* rebelling against *Rehoboam*, and *Jehu* against *Joram*; for these Rebellions have no less, if not more, approbation of God's Oracles, (1 *King.* 11. 31. and 2 *King.* 9. 6.) than *Asa*'s deposing his Mother. Such things therefore are recorded in holy Scripture to be read, but never to be imitated, (as we are not to kill our selves in imitation of *Sampson*, though after his death he is highly commended and by the Apostle reckon'd among the Faithful, *Heb.* 11. 32.) unless we have as plain a Revelation from God to do them, as King *Asa* had to depose his Mother by the advice of *Azariah* the Prophet.

Likewise they alledge, that the people of *France* rejected the King of *Navarr*, because of his Religion: But surely, they are either altogether ignorant, or wholly besotted and blinded, that make use of this example: For, (to omit that a vast number of Papists, and those too of the best and greatest Families of all *France*, then closly adhered to the King of *Navarr*, and thought themselves indispensably obliged in Conscience by the Law of Nature and the Principles of their Religion, so to do, notwithstanding

ſtanding the Kings being of a different perſwation, and all the Popes roaring Bulls and thundring Excommunicatios to the contrary, as the beſt Hiſtorians of them times do ſufficiently teſtify) to omit, I ſay, this conſideration, which ſhould make us emulous at leaſt of theſe Papiſts Loyalty: Do not all Proteſtants generally exclaim againſt thoſe other rebellious Papiſts, who then oppoſed that worthy Prince? With what face then can we produce it as a preſident to juſtify our own proceedings againſt his Royal Highneſs? Or ſhall we judge it Antichriſtian and unlawful in Papiſts to depoſe a Prince, but lawful and Chriſtian in Proteſtants? O blind zeal! let us not thus fooliſhly deceive our ſelves, but rather ſeriouſly conſider that dreadful ſentence of the Apoſtle; *Thinkeſt thou, O man, that judgeſt them which do ſuch things, and doeſt the ſame thy ſelf, that thou ſhalt eſcape the judgment of God?* Rom. 2. 3. How do we think to eſcape the ſeverity of Gods anger and his juſt judgment, if we condemn and deteſt the Romiſh uſurpation over Kings and Princes, and yet uſe the ſame our ſelves, without the leaſt remorſe of Conſcience?

But the Pamphleters blindneſs is yet more remarkable, when they ridiculouſly heap together, in the very front of their Sophiſtical and moſt unreaſonable reaſons, how ſuch and ſuch Princes have been either diſinherited, baniſhed, or put to death, whether by their own rebellious Subjects, or by other encroaching Princes; as *Eagar Atheling* was baniſhed by *William* the Conqueror, *Arthur Plantagenet* put to death by King *John*, and the like: But the ſilly Sophiſters never endeavoured, nor ever could juſtify theſe examples, or prove them either lawful or laudable. To what purpoſe then are ſuch unjuſtifyable preſidents produced by theſe factious Spirits, to warrant their own deſperate attempts? Surely, they might as well argue that Chriſt was crucified by the Jews, and thence infer that Subjects might lawfully crucifie or put to death their Soveraign, when and how they pleaſed. But ſuch Antichriſtian and Fanatical Logick was never heard, much leſs approved of, until the Spirit of *Belial* reveal'd it to *Oliver* and his Rumpers.

For if we look back to the Primitive Church, whoſe practice ſhould be a rule to our proceedings, though they were zealous to admiration of the true Faith and Worſhip of God, (*having the firſt fruits of the Spirit*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *Rom.* 8. 23.) and though their Soveraigns for many hundred years were either downright Idolaters, or blaſphemous Hereticks, and withall moſt Cruel Perſecutors of Chriſts Church, yet in all this time we cannot find one Prince diſinherited or depoſed by his Chriſtian Subjects, for being of a contrary profeſſion, no, nor yet for his Tyrannical Perſecutions: For they well knew how God commanded them, *To ſubmit themſelves to every Ordinance of man for the Lords ſake*, (1 Pet. 2. 13. and to obey higher powers, (though Heathens, as then they were) *beauſe there is no power but of God*, (Rom. 13. 1.) *By whom Kings do reign and Princes decree juſtice*, Prov. 8. 15. True Chriſtians were numerous in the days of *Conſtantius* and *Valens*, the *Arian* Emperors, and yet they never attempted to diſ-inherit or depoſe theſe Princes, notwithſtanding their Blaſphemous Hereſies. Many Chriſtians well knew how *Julian* the Apoſtate, notwithſtanding his external profeſſion of Chriſtianity, was a Heathen in his heart, long before he came to the Empire; and yet they never endeavoured to deprive him of his Birth-right, but left all to the providence of God, whom they aſſuredly knew alwayes potent, and willing to protect his own inheritance, *the Catholick Church*.

And to come nearer home, when Queen *Elizabeth* of glorious memory, came to the Crown of *England*, the Proteſtants of this Kingdom were but a handful in reſpect of the Papiſts, and though the Queen was already declared Illegitimate even by her own Father, and this confirmed by an Act of Parliament, yet the Papiſts endeavoured not to depoſe or debar her from her Right for being of a contrary Religion, but publickly own'd her as their true and lawful Sovereign. Shall we then ſhew our ſelves worſe than the Papiſts, or more miſtruſtful of God's mercy? Is it not evident, that our ſins are the cauſe why your Majeſty hath no lawful Iſſue? Should not we then rather remove the cauſe by our ſerious repentance, than prepoſterouſly endeavour to mend the matter, by adding fuel to the flame, heaping one ſin upon another, in robbing others of that which God and Nature has beſtowed upon them? Surely 'tis a *Motto* better beſeeming a Chriſtian, *Ruat Cœlum, & fiat Juſtitia*, than, *Faciamus mala, ut eveniant bona.* And it is the beſt Religion that gives every one his

due

due, not that which cannot ſubſiſt without depriving others of their undoubted Right.

But what do we intend to do, or ſhall we ſhake off all Conſcience, and neither regard our Loyalty to our Prince, nor yet our Oathes to God? Do not we remember, how in taking the Oath of Allegiance, we have called God to teſtifie our candour and ſincerity in pronouncing the enſuing words, *I do ſwear from my heart, that —— I will bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majeſty, his Heirs and Succeſſors, and him and them will defend to the uttermoſt of my power againſt all Conſpiracies and Attempts whatſo-ever, which ſhall be made againſt his or their Perſons, their Crown and Dignity, by reaſon or colour of any ſuch Sentence or Declaration, or otherwiſe* —— With what conſcience then can we ſubſcribe or conſent to that unadviſed Bill, fram'd by ſome Members of the Houſe of Commons againſt his Royal Highneſs, after ſwearing ſo poſitively to bear Faith and true Allegiance, not only to your Majeſty, but alſo to your Heirs and Succeſſors; nay, to defend them to the uttermoſt of our power againſt all attempts whatſoever, and ſwearing this with a *Non-obſtante* to any Sentence or Declaration, whether from the Pope or otherwiſe. For ſurely, the word [*otherwiſe*] excludes all other Sententences and Declarations, as well as the Popes; and conſequently no leſs excludes this ill-digeſted Bill of the Houſe of Commons, than the roaring Bulls of the See of *Rome*: For (as St. *Bernard* ſaith) *Nihil excipitur, ubi diſtinguitur nihil.*

Oh! but our great Politicians have found out a new Comment upon theſe words; for, in effect, they tell us, that by Heirs here, we are to underſtand thoſe that are created ſuch, not by God, but by the Parliament: And that although by Birth one might claim a right to ſucceed in the Government, yet when the Parliament declares to the contrary, and annulls this Claim, he is no longer Heir to the Crown, and conſequently the People are diſcharged from their Oath of Allegiance to him. A *Commentum* indeed, and a Diabolical Fiction, nay, the worſt of all Jeſuitical Equivocations: In the ſame Oath we call God to witneſs, that we ſwear in the plain and common ſenſe of the words, without any Equivocation, Mental Reſervation, or ſecret Evaſion whatſoever. And after ſwearing in this manner, how dare we make uſe of this ſo palpable an Equivocation, and ſecret Evaſion, which, if practiſed, ſhould render all Oathes vain and ineffectual, and this purpoſely to colour our own perfidious and perjurious dealings? We cannot deny, but that by Heir, in the plain and vulgar, or common ſenſe of the Word, we underſtand ſuch as by Blood (for Adoption is not uſual amongſt us) have greateſt right to ſucceed next in the Inheritance, or to poſſeſs the ſame. How then can we, without groſly equivocating, interpret it of Heirs made by Act of Parliament, at leaſt while the Natural Heir is alive, when we know it is an undoubted Maxim of the Law, *Solus Deus Haeredem facere poteſt, non homo?* Do not we ſee, that the worſt of Jeſuits could at this rate take the Oath of Allegiance, and gloſſing it after this new mode, underſtand by your Majeſties Heirs and Succeſſors, thoſe that ſhould be declared ſuch, not by King and Parliament, but by the Pope and See of *Rome*? Nay, could not he further alledge, in our Grand *Machivilians* new Dialect, that although a King of *England* had right till then to Rule and Govern the Kingdom, yet when the Pope declares to the contrary, and annuls this Right, he is no longer lawful King of *England*, and conſequently the People are, *eò ipſo*, abſolved from their Oath of Allegiance to him? What can our cunning Politicians alledge againſt this, or can they ſhew where the diſparity lies, ſince 'tis undeniable, that the Words of the Oath can as well bear this Jeſuitical Comment, as their own new-found Gloſſes? How then dare they deny the one, and uſe the other?

Moreover, this at leaſt muſt be granted: Whoſoever is by Blood next Heir to the Crown, we are by our Oath obliged before God to bear him Faith and true Allegiance, nay, to defend him againſt all attempts, until he is diſ-inherited by Act of Parliament. Whatſoever therefore we do againſt him before this Act be fully eſtabliſhed, is a violation of our Oath. And ſince it is manifeſt, that this unnatural and abortive *Embrio*, unluckily hatch'd by ſome over-active members of the Houſe of Commons, is directly againſt him, who by Blood is at preſent the next Heir to the Imperial Crown of *England*; it neceſſarily enſueth, that the very attempt of Voting and paſſing this unparalleled Bill, makes the Actors and Abettors thereof perjurers before God and the World.

To this perhaps our grand Politicians will anſwer, that the Duke is not Heir, but only Heir Apparent, to the Crown, becauſe (as *Coke* obſerved) *none is Heir before the death of his Anceſtor, but only Heir Apparent*, upon *Littleton*, p. 8. And hence in their new Machiavilian Logick will inforce, that to diſ-inherit his Royal Highneſs, is not againſt the Oath of Allegiance, which ſpeaketh only of Heirs, not of Heirs Apparent.

A ridiculous ſhift, and a moſt ſilly evaſion; firſt, becauſe we profeſs to take the Oath, not in any by-ſenſe of the Law, but in the plain and common ſenſe of the words, as all men do uſually underſtand them: Wherefore although the Law, by Heirs, had underſtood ſuch as ſucceed to their deceaſed Anceſtors, yet ſince this is not the plain and common ſenſe of the word,

and men do not generally understand it so, it can never excuse us from a perjurious violation of our Oath. 2dly. Because, by *Cokes* leave, this his observation is most fallacious and impertinent: For it is a manifest contradiction for one to be Heir Apparent, and not be Heir, as it's, to be a Learned man, and to be no man; it being an undoubted maxime, *Prius est esse, quam esse tale.* And the fallacy consists herein, that the word Heir, in its full and proper notion signifies either an Heir Apparent, who is such during the life of his Ancestor, or an Heir by right actually inheriting, which always presupposeth his Ancestors death, or at least his resignation: But *Coke* most improperly restrains it to the latter, contrary to the common and usual manner of speaking, not only of most men in general, but of God himself in his holy Scriptures, where Heirs Apparent are absolutely and most commonly called Heirs; as appeareth *Gen.* 15. 3. and 2 *Sam.* 14. 7 *Mat.* 21. 38. *Mark.* 12. 7. *Luk.* 20. 14. and *Gal.* 4. 1.

Since therefore it appeareth by so many passages of holy Scripture, that the word, Heir, in its plain and common sense signifieth an Heir Apparent, and that we profess before God and the World, to take the Oath of Allegiance in the plain and common sense of the words, upon what grounds can we understand here an Heir actually inheriting, more than an Heir Apparent? Nay, since the words of the Oath do signify as well an Heir Apparent, as an Heir actually inheriting, what a Sophistical Equivocation it is, to understand it of the one, exclusively of the other? Surely, it is no better, than if a Jesuit had Sworn before a Magistrate to be true and Loyal to the Government of this Kingdom, he in the interim meaning the Government, not of the King or Parliament, but of his own Jesuitical Assemblies.

Let us not therefore flatter our selves, or foolishly think that after so solemn an Oath, either, or both Houses of Parliament can authorize us before God to deprive our Prince of his undoubted right. And truely, I admire, if they, who so much insist upon the liberties of free-born *English* Subjects, will ever acknowledge the Parliament, or any person whatsoever, to have this arbitrary and despotical power, whereby the Axe is laid to the very root of their greatest privileges. For if it be lawful for a prevailing faction in Parliament to deprive their Prince of his undoubted Birthright, how can mean Subjects have any security either of property or liberty?

And besides, since it is an undoubted maxime in Moral Affairs, *Illud tantum possumus, quod de jure possumus*; and (as St. *Austine* saith) *Quod non potest juste, non potest justus:* Upon what grounds should the House of Commons, nay the whole Parliament, Claim this absolute power, I cannot find. For its evident, that both Houses can challenge no other authority, but what they derive from their Soveraign, and the diffusive body of the Subjects, whom they represent: And no less manifest it is, that no King of *England* hitherto did (nor, in my Opinion, could) give his Parliament any power to depose or dis-inherit himself, or his Heir Apparent. And if your Majesty intends to grant them any such thing at present, (which, I hope, your Princely wisdom will never do) I remember your Royal Father gave the long Parliament greater power than he was aware of, which they soon after used, or rather abused, against himself, his Crown and Dignity. And therefore I say, *Fœlix quem faciunt paterna pericula cautum.* As for the diffusive Body of the Subjects, 'tis clear, they neither would nor could grant the Parliament this extravagant Jurisdiction: First; they would not do it; for who can be so credulous as to believe, that any man so desirous of his liberty as *English* Subjects ever have been, would grant the Parliament this Despotical power, uncontroulably to dispose of his own, much less of his Princes Life or Estate. Secondly, How could the Subjects grant the Parliament any power to deprive their Prince of his Birth-right, against all the Laws of God and Nature, since of God alone, and not of the Subjects, the Prince deriveth his whole Right and Authority? *For there is no power but of God, Rom.* 13. 1. *By whom Kings do Reign, and Princes decree justice, Prov.* 8. 15. How then can the People deprive their Prince of that, which they have no power to give? As for my own particular, I must confess, I could never understand, that the Imperial Crown of *England* was disposable by Act of Parliament; I always thought the Liberties of *English* Subjects to be grounded on surer Principles, and that no power in this Kingdom could lawfully deprive us of our Priviledges, or enthrall us to any servitude; whereas it's evident, that if an Act of Parliament can thus transfer the Crown upon whom they please, we can have no security, and may, according to such Maxims, first or last be brought under the Tyranny of the *French* King, or any other Forreign Prince, if ever the corruption or mercinarines of a Parliament should induce them to comply with a King, that should have a mind to sell the Succession of the Crown to a Foreigner, upon the security of an Act of Parliament; which, according to the Tenets of these Politicians, can give a just Title.

But if we consult God's Divine Oracles, the Holy Scriptures, which undoubtedly should be the chief Rule of all Humane actions, we shall never find any Example or President to warrant these unparallel'd proceedings against his Royal Highness, but may find several passages clearly against it? There we find how King *Ahab*, though absolute Monarch of

Israel

Israel, and consequently needed no Parliament, but had himself alone as much power and authority over the Ten Tribes of *Israel*, as your Majesty and Parliament together can claim, *de jure*, over the Natives of *England*, and though this Monarch passionately coveted his Subject *Naboth*'s Vineyard, and was of himself little inclined to Justice, yet he knew, that by the Laws of God and Nature it was altogether unlawful for him to deprive *Naboth* of his Vineyard; but if he could not deprive him of a small Vineyard, surely he could not rob him of his Birth-right and whole Estate: And if such an absolute Monarch could not do this to a mean Subject, by what colour of Justice can the House of Commons, nay, the whole Parliament, do it to their undoubted Prince?

Certainly, if God was so much incensed against *Esau* for selling his Birth right to his Brother *Jacob*, as the Apostle tells us, *Heb.* 12.17. how much (think we) shall his fury be kindled against our proceedings, where not an ordinary man, as *Esau*, looseth his Birth-right, but a most illustrious Prince, by Birth and Lineal Descent of so many Glorious Kings; and looseth not a Birth-right to a small Inheritance, but to several Kingdoms; and that not made away by himself, but contrary to his will and all justice is robb'd thereof by a prevailing Faction of his Inferiours?

But if neither the unlawfulness of this desperate attempt, nor the heinous guilt of perjury thereupon necessarily ensuing, can move or deter us from it, yet let both our private and publick dangers, and the sad effects inevitably consequential thereunto, withdraw us from such violent proceedings. If it be God's pleasure, that his Royal Highness shall survive your Sacred Majesty, without having any Lawful Issue, we need not doubt, but he will endeavour to recover his Right by force, if by fair means he cannot. And in this case we may consider, how these three Kingdoms are most strangely divided into a numberless number both of Religions and Interests; and it is a true saying, *Omne Regnum in se divisum desolabitur*. And the strength of Protestants abroad is not very great, and their will to help us, if need require, I am afraid is less. But the Papists are very strong, and we may be sure the Pope will prevail with most of them to help a Catholick Prince, deprived of his Right for his Religion; and, no doubt, will not be backward himself in the Expedition. The *French* King likewise (who is now in a manner at peace with all the World, and yet must of necessity be somewhere in action, to give vent to the fiery Spirits of his busie Subjects) will undoubtedly be glad of the opportunity, and will hold it a glorious pretence to assist (though, I am afraid, most for his own ends) a Catholick Prince, excluded from his Kingdom for the Catholick Faith. And without all peradventure, his Royal Highness shall find enough even in these three Kingdoms, not onely of Papists, and other Male-contents, but also of the best and most conscientious Protestants, as in duty bound, ready to take his part in so just a quarrel.

How then shall we defend our selves, neither united at home, nor assisted from abroad? or shall we expect to be miraculously delivered by God, of whose protection and providence we shew our selves now so mistrustful? Truely, I am afraid, we shall rather be miraculously punished (like *Sodom* or *Gomorrah*) for our hainous sins and daily multiplyed transgressions, than any wayes delivered from the just judgments of God, unless we refrain in time from our desperate proceedings, and no more endeavour with such manifest injustice to hinder the order of Gods Providence, or debar our Prince, because of a different perswasion, from his undoubted Birthright. For nothing doth so much exasperate the divine patience and longanimity, as to establish injustice by publick authority, and to make that seem lawful, which the Law of God declares abominable. By what means then can we expect to escape his vengeance, if the great Representative of the whole Nation, which should reform and redress all transgressions of Gods Law, do attempt, contrary to the express word of God and all justice, to rob their Prince of his undoubted right, and to make the Imperial Crown of *England*, which since the beginning of Monarchy in this Island, was never got but by Conquest or Inheritance, now to go by Election, and the greatest Vote in the House of Commons; thereby making the King himself for all ensuing Ages to be Tenant at will to every prevailing Faction in Parliament? I say, Tenant at will; for nothing is more certain, than that by whatsoever power or pretence the Parliament can depose the presumptive Heir, by the same they may depose the actual possessor of the Crown; as the Rump Parliament well understood. For the fundamental Reason, why a presumptive Heir to the Crown may be dis-inherited or deposed either by King, Parliament, or both together, is, because whatsoever is suspected to tend to the Subversion of the Government, or of the true Religion here established by Law, is necessarily to be removed, to secure the good and welfare of the people, according to the Ancient saying: *Salus populi suprema lex esto*. But that this reason has no less force against the Actual Possessor, than against the Presumptive Heir, of the Crown, is a thing in it self so evident, that I think no man in his wits, especially acquainted with the late intestine troubles and present temper of our blind Zealots, can call it into question.

For.

For, what, if the King himself be at any time thus suspected to endeavour the Subversion of the Government, is there no remedy to be expected? Undoubtly their is, say our great Politicians, and a good one too: For, our Omnipotent Parliament, (*i. e.* themselves only and their Emissaries, whose Religion is the Bellowes of Rebellion) the grand Jury of the whole Nation, and the publick Inquest of all Grievances, is authorized by God (when the King fails) to use their absolute Power against all manner of persons, of what degree, or condition soever they be, to secure the good and welfare of the people, because (as before said) *Salus populi suprema lex esto.* And thus our grand Principle, as it is the fundamental Reason of deposing a presumptive Heir to the Crown, so it is the ground work of all Anarchy and Rebellion: It is the spring and source of all our last intestine troubles, which overflow'd the three Kingdoms with a deluge of crimson streames; nay, it was the chief foundation, whereon the bloody Rumpers chiefly insisted in Sacrificing our Royal Martyr, as a Tyrant Subverting the Government and true Protestant Religion. But if a Prince so mild, so just, and so Religious, be thus Cruelly Butcher'd upon these grounds by a prevailing Faction of his Subjects, it is inconceivable to me, how can any King of *England* judge himself otherwise than Tenant at will to every prevailing Faction in Parliament, or at least think himself secure, while such principles are maintained by his Subjects; especially if they be established by Law, as in effect they would have been, had that abortive Embrio of the House of Commons received life (which I hope will never happen) through the influence of Your Majesties Royal Assent.

Truly, our greatest comfort in this desperate juncture of Affairs, after the unlimitted mercy of our gracious Saviour, is, the assured confidence we always repose in Your Majesties Princely Wisdom and Courage, and in the Grave and Mature Deliberations of the House of Lords, and of Your most Honourable Privy-Council; whose tryed Loyalty both to Your Sacred Majesty, and to Your Royal Father, assures us, that neither the pretence of establishing the true Protestat Religion, (which of it self is sufficiently upheld by the mighty hand of God) nor any consideration of Temporal gain or Worldly interest, can induce them to decline in the least from their Sworn Allegiance and Fidelity to the Royal Blood of your Glorious Father, who so magnanimously deposed his life in defence of his Subjects Lives and Liberties, against the Anarchial encroachments of the Factious Members of the House of Commons in the Rump Parliament; whose footsteps some (I am afraid) no less Factious Members of this present House of Commons seem exactly to follow; pretending, as the former did, to secure and establish the true Protestant Religion, according to that *Machiavilian* maxime, *Quoties vis fallere plebem, finge Deum*: Whereas it is apparent, they do no more regard the establishing thereof, than the Rump Parliament did in *Oliver*'s dayes.

Yet this I say not (no, nor any thing else I have hitherto misliked or reprehended) of the whole House of Commons, much less of the whole Parliament: God forbid, I should think so ill of that Grave and Reverend Senate. I know there are many true and well-meaning Loyalists in that Honourable House, who bear the Faith and Allegiance, as well as the name and power of the Commons of *England*. And I am of Opinion, that as the Faithful and Orthodox Bishops at the Councel of *Arimine*, through their over zealous desire of procuring the peace and unity of Christs Church, were by the specious Arguments of the *Arians* inclined unawares to make a decree against the true Faith and Doctrine of Christ; which unadvised decree, themselves upon second thoughts and more mature deliberations, seeing the unexpected advantages their Adversaries took by their well intended condescension, immediatly recalled, and publickly protested against it: So these Loyal and well meaning Members of the House of Commons, through their excessive zeal of establishing the true Protestant Religion, were by the plausible pretences of some overactive Spirits, induced unwittingly to Vote against that Allegiance and Fidelity they Swore not only to your Majesty, but also to your Heirs and Successors; which over zealous Votes, I am fully perswaded, these same members, after due reflection perceiving the fatal consequences inevitably consequential to such proceedings, would have recalled, had they sate longer, or will at their next Sessions recall them, as being wholly repugnant not only to their Sworn Allegiance and Fidelity, but also to Gods revealed will.

But as to this, time will best discover the reality of all their intentions; and therefore I leave it to your Majesties further consideration, humbly submitting what I have said hitherto to your most Excellent Majesty, and to your most Honourable Privy Council; by whom, I hope, these my Reasons and Arguments shall be interpreted with that candour and sincerity, wherewith I here present them unto your most Excellent Majesty. And so begging of the Almighty to direct your Sacred Majesty in what is most advantageous to the Glory of God, and to the Spirritual and temporal welfare of your Loyal Subjects, I conclude this last of *June*, with my everlasting Prayer,

Vivat & Regnet in aternum & ultra Carolus *Secundus, nemini Secundus.*